

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were pending in the Application as of the Office Action of May 15, 2008. Claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 12, and 16 are cancelled with this response, and claims 1, 5, 10, 11, and 18 are amended. The Examiner's objection and rejections will now be respectfully addressed in turn.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings have been objected to for allegedly not showing every feature of the claims, particularly those features of claims 8 and 12. In Response, Applicant respectfully cancels claims 8 and 12.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-6, 11, 15, 16, and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over French Patent No. 2,769,944 to Bernard ("Bernard" hereinafter) in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA" hereinafter). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art and that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Amgen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

Applicant's claim 21 recites *inter alia*,

"side edges of each screen lying against the jambs to form an airtight lateral surface contact."

Applicant respectfully asserts that neither Bernard nor AAPA, taken alone or in combination, teach side edges of screens that lie against jambs to form an airtight lateral surface contact. On the contrary, as is stated by the Examiner at page 4 of the Office Action, Bernard does not teach jambs at all, and the AAPA to which the Examiner refers (specifically page 2, lines 32-37) regarding airtight lateral surface contact between edges of each screen and the jambs. Thus, as Bernard teaches nothing of jams, and AAPA teaches nothing of airtight lateral surface contact between jambs and screen edges, this proposed combination of Bernard and AAPA does not teach every element of Applicant's claims.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully asserts that the proposed combination of Bernard and AAPA does not teach every element of Applicant's claim 1, or claims 2-2, 11, 15, 16, and 20 that depend therefrom. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that *prima facie* obviousness does not exist regarding claims 1-6, 11, 15, 16, and 20 with respect to the proposed combination of Bernard and AAPSA. Since the proposed combination of Bernard and AAPSA fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 1-6, 11, 15, 16, and 20, clearly, one of ordinary skill at the time of Applicant's invention would not have a motivation to modify or combine the references **(this motivation is particularly in that Bernard teaches no jambs at all)**, or a reasonable likelihood of success in forming the claimed invention by modifying/combining. Thus, here again, *prima facie* obviousness does not exist. *Id.*

Applicant also notes that claim 1 has been amended to include previously presented claims 4, 6, 9, and 16, so as to present the claims in better condition for allowance, and correspond to European prosecution.

Claims 7-11, and 17-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Bernard in view of AAPA and United States Patent No. 5,207,256 to Kraeutler ("Kraeutler" hereinafter). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art and that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Amgen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

Claims 8 and 9 has been cancelled, and claims 7, 10, 11, and 17-19 depend from claim 1. As such, the proposed combination of Bernard and AAPA does not teach every element of Applicant's claims 7, 10, 11, and 17-19. As Kraeutler does not remedy the deficiencies of Bernard and AAPA, Applicant further and respectfully asserts that the proposed combination of Bernard, AAPA, and Kraeutler does not teach every element of Applicant's claims 7, 10, 11, and 17-19. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that *prima facie* obviousness does not exist regarding claims 7, 10, 11, and 17-19 with respect to the proposed combination of Bernard, AAPA, and Kraeutler. Since the proposed combination of Bernard, AAPA, and Kraeutler fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 7, 10, 11, and 17-19, clearly, one of ordinary skill at the time of Applicant's invention would not have a motivation to modify the reference, or a reasonable likelihood of success in forming the claimed invention by modifying. Thus, here again, *prima facie* obviousness does not exist. *Id.*

Claim 13 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Bernard in view of AAPA and United States Patent No. 6,119,758 to Coenraets ("Coenraets" hereinafter). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 13 depends from claim 1. As such, the proposed combination of Bernard and AAPA does not teach every element of Applicant's claim 13. As Coenraets does not remedy the deficiencies of Bernard and AAPA, Applicant further and respectfully asserts that the proposed combination of Bernard, AAPA, and Coenraets does not teach every element of Applicant's claim 13. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that *prima facie* obviousness does not exist regarding claim 13 with respect to the proposed

combination of Bernard, AAPA, and Coenraets. Since the proposed combination of Bernard, AAPA, and Coenraets fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 13, clearly, one of ordinary skill at the time of Applicant's invention would not have a motivation to modify the reference, or a reasonable likelihood of success in forming the claimed invention by modifying. Thus, here again, *prima facie* obviousness does not exist. *Id.*

Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Bernard in view of AAPA and Japanese Publication No. 2002142967 to Yana ("Yana" hereinafter). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 14 depends from claim 1. As such, the proposed combination of Bernard and AAPA does not teach every element of Applicant's claim 14. As Yana does not remedy the deficiencies of Bernard and AAPA, Applicant further and respectfully asserts that the proposed combination of Bernard, AAPA, and Yana does not teach every element of Applicant's claim 14. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that *prima facie* obviousness does not exist regarding claim 14 with respect to the proposed combination of Bernard, AAPA, and Yana. Since the proposed combination of Bernard, AAPA, and Yana fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 14, clearly, one of ordinary skill at the time of Applicant's invention would not have a motivation to modify the reference, or a reasonable likelihood of success in forming the claimed invention by modifying. Thus, here again, *prima facie* obviousness does not exist. *Id.*

Conclusion

Applicant believes that all of the outstanding objections and rejections have been addressed herein and are now overcome. Entry and consideration hereof and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) or 1.136(b) that may be necessary for entry and consideration of the present Reply.

If there are any charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

The Office is invited to contact applicant's attorneys at the below-listed telephone number concerning this Amendment or otherwise regarding the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Daniel R. Gibson/
Daniel R. Gibson
Registration No. 56,539
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
20 Church Street
22nd Floor
Hartford, CT 06103
Telephone: 860-286-2929
Facsimile: 860-286-0115
Customer No. 23413

Date: November 17, 2008